

REMARKS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated January 6, 2004 have been considered. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 16 are amended to correct typographical errors and not for purposes of patentability.

The Office Action Summary sheet is thought to erroneously indicate that claims 1-12 are rejected. The application as filed contained 16 claims, and the Detailed Action references all 16 claims. The rejection of claims 1-16 is traversed in this Response.

The Office Action indicates that the application lacks formal drawings. However, the originally filed drawings appear to conform to the rules, and no explanation is provided as to why the originally filed drawings are deemed informal. If there are deficiencies in the filed drawings, an explanation is respectfully requested. Otherwise, no resubmission of drawings is thought to be necessary.

The Office Action does not establish anticipation of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by US patent 5,794,239 to Walster et al. ("Walster"). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that Walster teaches all the limitations of the claims.

For example, claim 1 includes limitations of establishing a pattern database including a plurality of pattern definitions and response definitions, each pattern definition being associated with one or more associated response definitions, and one or more of the response definitions including one or more commands and instructions for queuing a command to a command queue having storage available for a plurality of commands; receiving message character strings at the message processor; searching the pattern database for pattern definitions that match the message character strings; and for the pattern definitions that match the messages, adding associated commands to the command queue in processing the response definitions; and dequeuing commands from the command queue and issuing the commands to the computing arrangement. The Office Action does not show that Walster teaches all of these limitations.

The pattern database includes response definitions that are associated with pattern definitions, and the response definitions include commands and instructions for queueing a

command to a command queue. The Office Action apparently alleges that by virtue of Walster's message processor 50 issuing commands 56 (FIG. 2), the commands may be added to a storage medium. This reading of Walster is apparently alleged to teach the limitations of the queueing a command to a command queue.

The fact that a command is issued and may be stored in a storage medium does not necessarily imply that there is a command queue being used. For example, a command may be issued, and the process/processor responsible for processing the command may be configured such that no further commands are accepted until processing of the current command is complete. Thus, storage of a command does not imply the presence of a command queue.

The rejection is also improper because it does not distinguish between the commands that are part of the response definitions and the additional instructions for queuing the commands to a command queue. The claim limitations clearly and individually identify both commands and instructions for queuing the commands to a command queue. The Office Action has only shown that Walster's pattern database has commands; no showing has been made that Walster's database also contains instructions for queuing the commands. For at least the reasons set forth above, the Office Action fails to show that Walster anticipates claim 1.

Claims 2 and 5 include further limitations related to use of a command queue. Therefore, the Office Action fails to show that Walster anticipates claims 2 and 5 for at least the reasons set forth above in regards to claim 1.

Claim 3 and 6 include limitations of pattern definitions for matching a message from a host, the message being associated with a high-level operation of a data storage system, pattern definitions for matching messages generated by the data storage system in performing the high-level operation of the storage system, and associated commands required for the high-level operation. The Office Action cites Walster's general teaching of pattern matching of messages and associated responses as teaching these limitations. However, it is respectfully submitted that Walster's general teaching does not show the specific use set forth in claims 3 and 6. Specifically, the Office Action does not establish that Walster shows or suggests messages associated with high-level operation of the storage system. Therefore, the Office Action fails to show that Walster anticipates claims 3 and 6.

Claim 4 includes further limitations of the pattern database including the command queue data structures. The Office Action cites Walster's pattern priorities as teaching this limitation. The cited teaching does not mention command queue data structures in the pattern database. Furthermore, there is no apparent relationship between pattern priorities and the claimed command queue data structures. Therefore, the Office Action does not establish that claim 4 is anticipated by Walster. If the rejection is maintained, further explanation of the asserted relationship between pattern priorities and the claimed command queues is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and, the Office Action fails to establish anticipation for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 8 includes further limitations on the implementation of the command queue, and the cited section of Walster teaches using delimiters in defining patterns. It is respectfully submitted that the claimed patterns and command queues are separate structures, and the Office Action has already applied Walster's patterns as meeting the limitations of the presently claimed patterns. Therefore, the Office Action is mistaken in asserting that Walster's patterns teach both the limitations of the claimed patterns and the claimed command queues.

Claims 9-16 are not shown to be anticipated by Walster for at least the reasons set forth above.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (USYS.028PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274